

Washington, DC, on August 1. A funeral is scheduled for August 2 at 11 a.m. in the Old Post Chapel on Fort Myers followed by an interment with full military honors and flyover at Arlington National Cemetery.

Throughout this long ordeal, Jack's family has persevered. Jack's father, Daniel Kennedy, Sr., died in 1986—10 years before his son's remains would be returned to the country he loved so much.

Jack's brother, Dan, whom I mentioned earlier, his wife Tamara, and their six children reside in Dumfries, VA. Jack's mother, Mrs. Sally Kennedy, lives in Lake Ridge, VA. Today, I would like to offer her our most sincere appreciation for the sacrifice her son Jack made in the service of his country, and for the steadfast faith with which she has endured the tremendous sense of loss, the unparalleled uncertainty and the incomprehensible frustration that, in some small measure, will be lessened in the very near future.●

LITERACY: ONE TOOL FOR ENDING WELFARE DEPENDENCE

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, the welfare bill recently passed by the Senate provides that families may be denied cash assistance after receiving benefits for a cumulative period of 5 years. States are also required to have 15 percent of welfare recipients involved in work participation. By 2002, this percentage must increase to 50 percent of the people on assistance. The bill as it entered the Senate, however, would clearly have failed to prepare these people for the jobs that they are required to obtain.

The facts are clear—you are highly unlikely to get off assistance and into work if you are unable to read.

Vocational education under the bill as it came to the floor was limited to no more than 12 months for any individual. Most education and training programs have a 2-year duration, and therefore, cannot be completed within the bill's time allowance.

In addition, States are unable to incorporate adult basic education activities into the training programs. This, at a time when we know more than ever about the link between adult education and literacy and dependence on the welfare system.

Analysis by the Urban Institute shows that of people who have been AFDC recipients of less than 25 months, 34.8 percent have not obtained a high school degree or a GED. But, among recipients who receive AFDC assistance for 60 months or more, this number jumps to 62.8 percent. The less educated a person is, the longer he or she is likely to remain reliant on the welfare system.

A 1995 report released by the Policy Information Center at the Education Testing Service also notes that welfare recipients with higher literacy levels worked more weeks and earned higher

average weekly wages in comparison with other recipients during the previous year. All this simply reinforces the importance of education and literacy in helping people get off, and stay off, the welfare system.

This bill as it came to the Senate did not provide enough flexibility, and did not allow the necessary education and training required to produce successful employees. In order to correct the inflexibility of this welfare bill, Senators SIMON, JEFFORDS, KERRY, SPECTER, and I yesterday proposed and passed a literacy amendment that will let states do what is needed.

This amendment has three basic provisions. The length of allowable educational training will be extended from 12 to 24 months; extending training period to permit the completion of training programs. The amendment also expands the definition of vocational training to include adult basic education, such as a GED completion course.

Without basic educational and literacy levels, people cannot perform job duties nor can they expand their skills through more advanced education. The amendment also allows States to increase people in educational programs from 20 to 30 percent of their participation percentages. States with high unemployment rates might otherwise find it difficult to place workers who have virtually no skills.

This amendment provides solutions to get people learning, and building skills. I want to thank Senators SIMON and JEFFORDS for their leadership on these efforts. With the adoption of this amendment, people on public assistance will be able to gain the basic skills they need to become productive workers and remain off the welfare system.●

WELFARE REFORM

● Mr. PELL. Mr. President, like so many of my colleagues, I would like to reform the Nation's welfare system. I believe that able-bodied people should work and that our Nation's safety net should be just that: a safety net. But I cannot let my desire to vote for welfare reform cloud my judgment about the bill that the Senate passed yesterday. I have several major concerns about this bill:

First, this bill eliminates welfare as an entitlement and replaces it with a block grant. To some, the term entitlement has come to mean an expectation that some people have of support from the Government with no effort on their part to achieve self-sufficiency. Defined in those terms, I agree that any sense of entitlement must end. But what the word entitlement actually means here is that this Nation will respond to anyone in great need—that we will not cut off people in need simply because there are too many people in line before them. A block grant is almost guaranteed to cut off people in need, with children suffering the great-

est harm. And while I reluctantly voted last year for the then pending welfare bill, which included a block grant, I did so primarily to strengthen the Senate's position in conference against a far more damaging House-passed bill.

Second, I believe that instead of giving people a hand up and out of the welfare system, we have limited their options and their opportunities further. For the most part, we have simply shifted this serious national problem to the States, and we have done so without providing them with adequate support to address the problem.

Third, I am concerned about the bill's harsh treatment of legal immigrants. More often than not, these individuals are hard working, taxpaying individuals who deeply appreciate and value the freedom and opportunity of the United States. I cannot agree to deny them so many of the benefits that they might legitimately need as they build a life here.

Finally, my deepest concern is for the children. No matter what the faults of the parent, we as a society must do all we can to protect and nurture the next generation. Otherwise, no matter how tough our welfare policy or how good our toughness makes us feel, we will raise a generation of children who are incapable of functioning in society, much less leading it. I simply cannot believe that eliminating an entitlement which ensures that all poor children get the food, clothing, and shelter that they need can move us individually or as a society down the path we all want to go.

Mr. President, it is with real regret, then, that I cast a "no" vote on this welfare reform legislation. I know that the will of the people demands action, and I very much want to be part of an effort to pass a quality welfare reform bill. And I have joined with many of my Senate colleagues in voting for amendments that, had they been approved, might have made the bill acceptable. But looking at the final product, I cannot say that what we have adopted is better than what we now have. The risk to our children's future is too great. I will not punish a child to teach its parent, and I believe that this is what this legislation, in the end, will do.

I regret that the Senate did not approve the work first proposal introduced by Senate DASCHLE. And I continue to support its emphasis on transitioning welfare recipients to work, its understanding that providing childcare is a linchpin of successful reform, and its premise that—despite very real abuses of the current system by some welfare recipients—most people want to get off welfare and work at a job that provides a living wage. In any effort to pass this kind of welfare reform legislation, I will cast a sure and solid "yea" vote.●